

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**SEP 28 2007**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NOEL BRAVO-SOSA,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-10282

D.C. No. CR-01-00264-MCE

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Morrison C. England, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 24, 2007<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Noel Bravo-Sosa appeals from the district court's judgment upon limited remand pursuant to *United States v. Ameline*, 409 F.3d 1073 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc), concluding that his 293-month sentence would not have been materially

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

different under the advisory Sentencing Guidelines. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Bravo-Sosa contends that the district court failed to adequately state reasons for the sentence, and that the sentence is unreasonable under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). However, the district court considered the sentence upon limited remand and determined that it would not have imposed a materially different sentence under an advisory Guidelines system. We conclude that the district court understood the full scope of its discretion following *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005). *See United States v. Combs*, 470 F.3d 1294, 1296-97 (9th Cir. 2006). Accordingly, the district court's decision was reasonable. *See id.*

**AFFIRMED.**